

22 June 1974

MEMO FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT

Discussions with OTS on the SRI Project

SG11

1. OOB Ops Testing. On 27 June 74 I met with [ ] of OTS to review with them their protocol for testing one of the SRI subjects in an OOB 'viewing' of a Soviet target; the substance of their proposal may be seen in the attached draft. Though many other aspects were discussed, the only points made by me which touched on our basic research interests may be summarized as follows: we'd like to have EEG, GSR and plethysmograph monitoring of the subject during the trials (OTS felt that such instrumentation might obscure or interfere with the initial trials but agreed to work them in at a later stage should there be any positive results); the OTS personnel should prepare a memo detailing all their own factual knowledge of the Soviet site before they go to SRI for the tests; in view of the subject's relative incompetence with drawings, provision be made for him to construct models of what he 'sees' out of lagoon or similar materials; that all his models, drawings, transcripts, etc, be sent to NPIC for evaluation before the OTS personnel go to SRI and are exposed to the subject. On 18 July 74 [ ] briefed [ ] myself (and others) on the outcome of the experiments. Since the detailed evaluation will be prepared by OTS, it is sufficient here to state that: for practical reasons, none of the above suggestions were implemented; though some of the details of the subject's perceptions of the target seem impressive, the overall results were mixed at best; [ ] and I strongly urged that the scoring of the results be related to the total stimulus field (based on NPIC photography) rather than focus merely on the subject's specific 'hits' and 'misses'. Recognizing that scoring on that basis would provide more valid statistics on the subject's performance, OTS felt that such exhaustive analysis could not reasonably be asked of NPIC.

SG11

2. SRI's Performance in re Basic Research. On 27 June 74 OTS was given an advanced copy of my 17-18 June SRI trip report. During the 18 July meeting, in response to the criticisms contained in the trip report and the allusion to the possibility of terminating the project, [ ] asked for more details on our position. After reviewing SRI's spotty performance thus far, we stressed that we had explicitly told SRI that they had to make significant progress with respect to the five items listed in para 5 of the trip report by mid-August. [ ] stated that he would send SRI an official letter covering those points so that, should termination eventually be necessary, our case would be well-documented. It was agreed that [ ] would make a prolonged site visit soon after the mid-August meetings with the SRI representatives in D.C.--either to monitor the continuing research (if acceptable progress has been made by then) or to gather evidence for termination of, at least, the basic research portion of the project. Other alternatives, such as allowing SRI a no-additional-cost extension to complete the basic research tasks, were also discussed.

SG11